



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 10/075,149      | 02/14/2002  | Milivoje Aleksic     | 00100.02.0060(990060D-1) | 7928             |

7590 07/19/2005

Christopher J. Reckamp  
Vedder Price Kaufman & Kammholz  
222 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2600  
Chicago, IL 60601

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KING, JUSTIN

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2111

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,149

Applicant(s)

ALEKSIC ET AL.

Examiner

Justin I. King

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                         |                                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                             | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iachetta, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,171), Kelley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,568), and Heil et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,407).

Referring to claim 18: Iachetta discloses a data processing system including a system controller (figure 4, structure 640) and a high-speed arbiter (figure 4, structure 710), an I/O controller (figure 4, structure 810), and a second arbiter (figure 4, structure 910). Iachetta discloses a memory system (figure 4, structure 660) connected to the system controller.

Although Iachetta does not explicitly disclose the logic for controlling the memory's I/O operations, Iachetta's memory cannot function properly without one. Such memory I/O control

Art Unit: 2111

logic is the claimed memory control channel. Iachetta discloses that the system controller connects to a high-speed PCI bus (figure 4, structure 680), and the I/O controller connects to a low-speed PCI bus (figure 4, structure 860). Iachetta does not disclose that each arbiter is physically integrated into the system controller or the I/O controller. Iachetta also does not disclose two separate memory channels.

Kelly discloses a bridge supporting multiple frequency speeds (figure 3). Kelly's bridge has an integrated arbiter (figure 3, structure 102) to arbitrate bus access among different frequency segments. Kelly teaches one to integrate the arbiter into the bridge to arbitrate the bus according to the priority.

Heil discloses a multiple-port structure. Heil discloses two separate memory channel controllers (figure 8, structures 134, 136, 142, and 144). Heil teaches that the general access latency caused by the severe bandwidth constraint can be improved with the dual memory channels (column 1, lines 52-56).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time Applicant made the invention to adapt the Kelly and Heil's teachings onto Iachetta because Kelly teaches one to integrate an arbiter into the bridge to arbitrate the bus according to the each frequency segment's relative workload, and Heil teaches one to improve the general access latency by the dual memory channels.

Referring to claims 19-20: Iachetta's high-speed bus at 66 MHz is at least 10 percent faster than the low-speed bus at 33 MHz.

Referring to claim 21: Iachetta discloses a data storage device (figure 4, structure 660) couple to the I/O controller to transmit data at a higher rate.

Art Unit: 2111

4. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iachetta and Kelley.

Referring to claim 22: Iachetta discloses a data processing system including a system controller and a first arbiter (figure 4, structures 640 and 710), and an I/O controller and a second arbiter (figure 4, structures of 810 and 910). Iachetta discloses that the system controller connects to a high-speed PCI bus (figure 4, structure 680), and the I/O controller connects to a low-speed PCI bus (figure 4, structure 860). The high-speed PCI bus is the claimed first bus of a predefined protocol type at a first data rate. The low-speed PCI bus is the claimed second bus. The I/O controller's connecting means to the high-speed PCI bus is the claimed control circuitry. Iachetta does not disclose that each arbiter is physically integrated into the system controller or the I/O controller.

Kelly discloses a bridge supporting multiple frequency speeds (figure 3). Kelly's bridge has an integrated arbiter (figure 3, structure 102) to arbitrate bus access among different frequency segments. Kelly teaches one to integrate the arbiter into the bridge to arbitrate the bus according to the priority.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time Applicant made the invention to adapt the Kelly's teachings onto Iachetta because Kelly teaches one to integrate an arbiter into the bridge to arbitrate the bus according to the each frequency segment's relative workload.

Referring to claim 23: Iachetta discloses an I/O device (figure 4, structure 940) couple to the control circuitry of the second controller without being coupled to the arbiter of the first controller.

*Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

6. In response to Applicant's argument that the prior arts on record fails to disclose the high speed arbiter coupled to the I/O controller (Remark, page 3, last paragraph, lines 7-10): Iachetta discloses that the high-speed system controller is coupled to the low-speed I/O controller (figure 4). As stated in the Office Action, Iachetta does not disclose that the high-speed arbiter is physically integrated into the system controller; therefore, Iachetta alone does not disclose that the high-speed arbiter coupled to the low-speed I/O controller. Kelly's bridge has an integrated arbiter (figure 3, structure 102) to arbitrate bus access. Kelly teaches one to integrate the arbiter into the bridge to arbitrate bus access according to the priority. Hence, the combination of the prior arts does disclose that the high speed arbiter coupled to the I/O controller.

7. In response to Applicant's argument that the Kelly is teaching away from the Iachetta (Remark, page 4, first paragraph, lines 9-10): Kelly's bridge has an integrated arbiter (figure 3, structure 102) to arbitrate bus access. Kelly teaches one to integrate the arbiter into the bridge to arbitrate the bus according to the priority. Kelly's teaching on the component integration does not teach away from Iachetta. The practice of the component integration will not defeat any of Iachetta's functions since each arbiter remains arbitrating the bus assess requests to its associated bus.



***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin I. King whose telephone number is 571-272-3628. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632 or on the central telephone number, (571) 272-2100. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished


Art Unit: 2111

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will cease to be mailed to applicants with Office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of foreign patents and non-patent literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available on the USPTO web site ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)), from the Office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. patent or patent application publications will not be granted.



Justin King  
July 14, 2005



Glenn A. Auve  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100